

-7-

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action of April 30, 2008. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-24 are requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1, 2, 8-12, 14, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Jeromin (US 5,381,014).

Claims 3, 4, 13, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jeromin.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jeromin in view of Catchpole (US 4,675,739).

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jeromin in view of Kobayashi (US 5,914,485).

Claim 6 was indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

Claims 17-20 stand allowed.

The Claims Are Now in Condition for Allowance

Claim 6, which was indicated as containing allowable subject matter, has been placed in independent form. Claims 2-5, 7-9, 14, and 16 have been amended to depend from claim 6. Accordingly, it is submitted that **claims 2-9, 14, and 16** are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 10 has been amended to add language analogous to allowed claim 17, and to remove unnecessary limitations. Accordingly, it is submitted that **claim 10 and claims 11-13 and 21-23 dependent therefrom** are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 15 has been placed in independent form. In Jeromin, each readout line 13 is connected with a charge amplifying detector 36. Only one of the sensors 4n is actively connected with each readout line at a time. That is, when a bias voltage is applied on address line 11, charge from only one sensor flows to each charge amplifying detector 36. Claim 15 calls for at least one analog multiplexer connected with the readout lines. Because each readout line 13 of Jeromin carries the charge signal from only one sensor 4n to the corresponding charge amplifying detector 36, it

-8-

is submitted that there is nothing in Jeromin to multiplex. Accordingly, it is submitted that Jeromin provides no motivation to incorporate analog multiplexers, much less the claimed combination of analog multiplexers, at least one analog to digital converter, at least one amplifier, and one or more digital multiplexers. Accordingly, it is submitted that **claim 15** distinguishes patentably over Jeromin and is now in condition for allowance.

New **claim 24** is based on claim 1, but amended to include the subject matter from page 3, lines 23-25 of the present application. Specifically, claim 24 calls for the logic for addressing the sensor elements to be integrated into the array of sensor elements. In this manner, no edge of the substrate is used to accommodate an addressing circuit. This claimed integration of the logic into the array enables the sensor elements to extend to three edges of the substrate as claimed in claim 6. It is submitted that Jeromin and the other references of record fail to disclose or fairly suggest this integration of the logic or the resultant advantage of the sensor elements being able to extend to three edges of the substrate.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

-9-

JUL 30 2008

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that all claims distinguish patentably over the references of record. An early allowance of all claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY SHARPE LLP

Robert M. Sieg

Thomas E. Kocovsky, Jr.
Reg. No. 28,383
Robert M. Sieg
Reg. No. 54,446
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582

Direct All Correspondence to:
Yan Glickberg, Reg. No. 51,742
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
(440) 483-3455 (tel)
(440) 483-2452 (fax)